HN

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,773	12/27/2001	Matthew Rozek	088305-0140	9808

22428 7590 11/08/2005

FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER	
RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/026,773	ROZEK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laurie Ries	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 August 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16,18,20-36,38 and 40-48* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16,18,20-36,38 and 40-48* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *27 December 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment, filed 24 August 2005, to the original application filed 27 December 2001.

2. The objection to claims 38 and 40 has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

3. The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-12, 15-16, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

4. Claims 1-3, 7-16, 18, 20-23, 27-36, 38, 40-42, and 45-46 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eck (U.S. Publication 2002/0129059 A1) in view of Myllymaki ("Effective Web Data Extraction with Standard XML Technologies").

5. Claims 4, 24, 43, and 47 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eck (U.S. Publication 2002/0129059 A1) in view of Myllymaki ("Effective Web Data Extraction with Standard XML Technologies") and Webber (U.S. Patent 6,418,400 B1).

6. Claims 5 and 25 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eck (U.S. Publication 2002/0129059 A1) in view of Myllymaki ("Effective Web Data

Extraction with Standard XML Technologies"), Webber (U.S. Patent 6,418,400 B1) and Huang (U.S. Publication 2002/0147748 A1).

7. Claims 6, 26, 44, and 48 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eck (U.S. Publication 2002/0129059 A1) in view of Myllymaki ("Effective Web Data Extraction with Standard XML Technologies") and De La Huerga (U.S. Patent 6,516,321 B1).

8. Claims 1-16, 18, 20-36, 38, and 40-48 are pending. Claims 17, 19, 37, and 39 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 21, 41, and 45 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-3, 7-16, 18, 20-23, 27-36, 38, 40-42, and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eck (U.S. Publication 2002/0129059 A1) in view of Myllymaki ("Effective Web Data Extraction with Standard XML Technologies").

As per claims 1 and 21, Eck discloses a computer readable medium on a computer system and a method for translating between an XML-type document and a first type of document, in the form of a flat file, including generating a data model for the XML-type document based on an XML data source (See Eck, Page 4, paragraph 0075), and generating a data model for the first type of document based on the XML data source (See Eck, Page 4, paragraph 0075). Eck also discloses storing the data model for the XML-type document, the data model for the first type of document, and the mapping rules in the storage device (See Eck, Page 2, paragraph 0038). Eck does not disclose expressly that mapping rules are created between the data model for the XML-type document and the data model for the first type of document and verifying that the XML-type document is well-formed based upon the data model for the XML-type document. Myllymaki discloses the creation of mapping rules between an XML type document and a first type of document. (See Myllymaki, Page 690, Column 1, paragraph 2, lines 5-14). Myllymaki also discloses verifying that the XML-type document is well-formed (See Myllymaki, Page 691, Column 1, Section 3.2, lines 4-11). Eck and Myllymaki are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of translating documents from one format to another. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the mapping rules and verification of syntax of Myllymaki with the file translation method of Eck. The motivation for doing so would have been to help with subsequent data extraction steps. (See Myllymaki, Page 691, Section 3.2, lines 5-10). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to combine Myllymaki with Eck for the benefit of simplifying subsequent data extraction steps to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1 and 21.

As per claims 2 and 22, Eck and Myllymaki disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 21 as described above. Eck also discloses creating an executable file to effect the translation between the XML-type document and the first type of document based on the data model for the XML-type document, the data model for the first type of document, and the mapping rules, and running the executable file to translate between the XML-type document and the first type of document. (See Eck, Page 1, paragraph 0003).

As per claims 3 and 23, Eck and Myllymaki disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 21 as described above. Eck also discloses translating test data based on the data model for the XML-type document, the data model for the first type of document, and the mapping rules (See Eck, Page 1, paragraph 0005), and verifying the propriety of the data model for the XML-type document, the data model for the first type of document and the mapping rules based on the result of the translation (See Eck, Page 6-7, paragraphs 0117-0132).

As per claims 7 and 27, Eck and Myllymaki disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 21 as described above. Eck also discloses receiving an indication of the direction of the translation (See Eck, Page 4, paragraph 0065, and Figure 5).

As per claims 8 and 28, Eck and Myllymaki disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Eck also discloses including receiving an indication of the identity of the XML data source (See Eck, Figure 5).

As per claims 9 and 29, Eck and Myllymaki disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 21 as described above. Eck also discloses that the XML data source is an XML Schema Definition (XSD) (See Eck, Page 1, paragraph 0019).

As per claims 10 and 30, Eck and Myllymaki disclose the limitations of claims 9 and 29 as described above. Eck also discloses providing a model for numerics in the XSD (See Eck, Page 6, paragraph 0117).

As per claims 11 and 31, Eck and Myllymaki disclose the limitations of claims 9 and 29 as described above. Eck also discloses providing a model for grouping and pattern definitions in the XSD (See Eck, Page 5, paragraphs 0088 and 0090).

As per claims 12 and 32, Eck and Myllymaki disclose the limitations of claims 9 and 29 as described above. Eck also discloses providing a model for field lengths (See Eck, Page 5, paragraph 0087) and value ranges (See Eck, Page 4, paragraph 0076).

As per claims 13 and 33, Eck and Myllymaki disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 21as described above. Eck also discloses creating a map component file, which identifies the data models for the XML-type document, and the first type of document (See Eck, Page 6, paragraphs 0113-0114), and where running the executable file includes referencing the map component file to perform the translation (See Eck, Page 6, paragraph 0115).

As per claims 14 and 34, Eck and Myllymaki disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 21 as described above. Eck also discloses receiving an indication of the identity of the XML-type document to be translated (See Eck, Figure 5).

As per claims 15 and 35, Eck and Myllymaki disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 21 as described above. Eck also discloses validating that the translation between the XML-type document and the first type of document is accurate (See Eck, Pages 6-7, paragraphs 0117-0132).

As per claims 16 and 36, Eck and Myllymaki disclose the limitations of claims 15 and 35 as described above. Eck also discloses receiving an indication of how to perform the validation (See Eck, Page 7, paragraph 0123).

As per claims 18 and 38, Eck and Myllymaki disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 21 as described above. Eck also discloses that the checking includes determining that each element in the XML-type document has start and end tags with the same label (See Eck, Page 7, paragraphs 0126-0127).

As per claims 20 and 40, Eck and Myllymaki disclose the limitations of claims 15 and 35 as described above. Eck also discloses that the validation also includes determining that elements in the XML-type document are in the correct order (See Eck, Page 6, paragraph 0113), determining that the XML-type document includes any specified mandatory elements (See Eck, Page 7, paragraph 0131), determining if data types in the XML-type document are proper (See Eck, Page 7, paragraph 0123), and determining if the format of a value in a field in the XML-type document is proper (See Eck, Page 7, paragraph 0128).

As per claims 41 and 45, Eck and Myllymaki disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Eck also discloses a computer system for translating between an XML-type document and a first type of document including a processor, and a memory,

coupled to the processor, including a number of instructions executed by the processor configured to perform the functionality disclosed in claim 1. (See Eck, Figure 2, and Page 2, paragraph 0037).

Claims 42 and 46 are rejected on the same basis as claim 2.

10. Claims 4, 24, 43, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eck (U.S. Publication 2002/0129059 A1) in view of Myllymaki ("Effective Web Data Extraction with Standard XML Technologies") as applied to claims 1, 21, 41, and 45 above, and further in view of Webber (U.S. Patent 6,418,400 B1).

As per claims 4 and 24, Eck and Myllymaki disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 21 as described above. Eck also discloses modifying the data model for the first type of document to conform to a format associated with the first type of document (See Eck, Page 6, paragraph 0111). Eck and Myllymaki do not disclose expressly modifying the mapping rules based on the modification of the data for the first type of document. Webber discloses modifying mapping rules using a Modify mode (See Webber, Column 7, lines 62-67, and Column 8, lines 1-6). Eck, Myllymaki and Webber are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of mapping electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the modification of mapping rules of Webber with the system and method of Eck and Myllymaki. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to create rules used for data validation (See Webber, Column 8, lines 7-9). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Webber with Eck and Myllymaki for the benefit of

allowing the modification of mapping rules for testing purposes to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4 and 24.

Claims 43 and 47 are rejected on the same basis as claim 4.

11. Claims 5 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eck (U.S. Publication 2002/0129059 A1) in view of Myllymaki ("Effective Web Data Extraction with Standard XML Technologies") Webber (U.S. Patent 6,418,400 B1) as applied to claims 4 and 24 above, and further in view of Huang (U.S. Publication 2002/0147748 A1).

As per claims 5 and 25, Eck, Myllymaki and Webber disclose the limitations of claims 4 and 24 as described above. Eck, Myllymaki and Webber do not disclose expressly adjusting the data model for the first type of document to conform with an import utility of an application associated with the first type of document. Huang discloses using an import utility to edit associated meta-tag information for a file. (See Huang, Page 5, paragraph 0069). Eck, Myllymaki, Webber and Huang are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of translating electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the use of an import utility program of Huang with the system and method of Eck, Myllymaki and Webber. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for simple creation of a file (See Huang, Page 5, paragraph 0069). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Huang with Eck, Myllymaki, and Webber for the benefit of easily creating the file to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 25.

12. Claims 6, 26, 44, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eck (U.S. Publication 2002/0129059 A1) in view of Myllymaki ("Effective Web Data Extraction with Standard XML Technologies") as applied to claims 1, 21, 41, and 45 above, and further in view of De La Huerga (U.S. Patent 6,516,321 B1).

As per claims 6 and 26, Eck and Myllymaki disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 21 as described above. Eck and Myllymaki do not disclose expressly omitting formatting that is present in the data model for the XML-type document. De La Huerga discloses removing all XML tags from a document. (See De La Huerga, Column 27, line 21). Eck, Myllymaki, and De La Huerga are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the omission of XML tags of De La Huerga with the system and method of Eck and Myllymaki. The motivation for doing so would have been to ensure that tag enabled applications do not reference incorrect information from the data (See De La Huerga, Column 27, lines 26-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine De La Huerga with Eck and Myllymaki for the benefit of providing accurate data to obtain the invention as specified in claims 6 and 26.

Claims 44 and 48 are rejected on the same basis as claim 6.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed 24 August 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues on Page 11 of the Instant Amendment that Myllymaki fails to teach verifying that an XML-type document is well-formed based upon a data model for the XML-type document. The Office respectfully disagrees. Myllymaki teaches that HTML content is translated into well-formed XML syntax in order to help subsequent data extraction steps or procedures. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to conclude that the data translated into well-formed XML syntax had been verified to contain well-formed XML syntax. The motivation for verifying that the data translated into well-formed XML syntax was actually well-formed would have been to help in subsequent data extraction steps (See Myllymaki, Page 691, Column 1, Section 3.2, 1st paragraph). Therefore, it would have been obvious to conclude that the XML-type data of Myllymaki was verified to be well-formed based upon the data model.

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

16. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

William L Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
11/4/2006